

WHOLE NO. 231

Resolved, That we regard the loss of a third party as a departure from the principles on which

plenty and times better.

Within the last year, you have complained much of your subscribers for not paying up their subscriptions to the Philanthropist—and even threatened to strike off from the subscription list in default of the first day of July, 1840, and send their accounts for collection. But in the 216th No. of your paper, you say—“So many letters have been sent [you] appealing to the extreme hardness of the times as a reason for not paying punctually,” that you have at last reluctantly consented to defer the time of payment, &c. You say also that one of your agents writes to you that he fears you will lose one-half of your subscribers if you are rigid in enforcing payments now; and believes “that there are many that would pay after harvest who cannot do it now, unless they coin money out of blood.” I ask, if you continue the present administration in power, how can you expect the times will be any better, and when will your subscribers be better able to pay than they now are? Is it not reasonable to suppose that if the sub-treasury law is continued in force, money must become more scarce?

If this view of the subject be correct, will not the cause of abolition be somewhat advanced by putting down the present administration, and supplying its place by those who will produce a more favorable state of things in money matters?

The annexation of Texas to the Union is an administration measure.—The object of which, doubtless is, to strengthen the slave-holding power. And what reason have we to expect that this measure will not be accomplished, if the present party remain in power? And would not the cause of emancipation be greatly crippled in such an event? And if so, would it not gain much by putting down the present administration?

The standing army scheme, proposed by Sec. Polk, and strongly recommended by Mr. Van Buren, is also an administration measure. And I ask in the name of heaven, what reason have we to expect it will not become a law of the land on the 4th of July, 1844? And be proclaimed to the world as a third declaration of American independence, if Mr. Van Buren is re-elected, and in its untimely march westward sever the limbs from the bodies of some of our worthy citizens? Certainly it has met with much less opposition in its inception, than did the sub-treasury bill four years ago. And should this become a law, with the purse already in the hands of the executive, then we may bid farewell to the cause of emancipation—farewell to the liberty of the press and the freedom of speech—farewell to every thing dear and valuable in the name of republicanism. This is no imaginary picture; you see with what fearful strides, power and corruption are making inroads upon our free institutions. And is it not the duty of every good American citizen, to use all the means within his power, to stay the tide of corruption and abuse, and bring about a better state of things if possible; even if he cannot accomplish all he desires?

And now, has not the cause of abolition something to gain by pursuing such a course?

The “black laws” lately passed by the Ohio legislature (than which none can be more black) are also an administration measure, although a few whigs* voted for the bill. And should the present party remain in power, have we not every reason to fear they will pass laws to prohibit our writing, printing or speaking on the subject of slavery, under severe penalties? And what assurance have we that they will not eventually adopt the principles laid down in Gov. McDuffie’s message, reducing the laboring portion of the people of the North, to the condition of the slaves at the South, in order to become a settled form of government?

The adoption of the gag resolutions both in Congress and in the legislature of Ohio, is an administration measure, so far as the north is concerned. At the south, both parties are arrayed against abolition; but at the north, the administration party alone, as such, is arrayed against abolitionism. Witness their resolutions, at their state convention at Columbus, on the 8th of last January, as well as all their doings in the legislative halls. This the whigs as a party, have not done. And is not this a good reason why the abolitionists should support the latter in preference to the former party? Certainly they have more to fear from the combined force of a great political party, than from individual effort.

Again—Mr. Van Buren, in his first message to Congress, declared, that if he should pass a bill to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, [and that too when there was no such bill before Congress] he would veto it; thus foisting Congress on that important subject.—“This I do not believe Gen. Harrison would do. He would doubtless veto the action of Congress, and then approve or disapprove, as he should think the interest of his country demanded.”

There is also something about the conduct of Martin Van Buren in the Amistad case, in the second attempt which was made to ship the poor Africans off to Spain, in the event of judgment being rendered against them, without giving them an opportunity of further redress, which should excite the honest indignation of every American citizen.

But we hear much about consistency and are told that if abolitionists would vote a liberty ticket, they would be consistent with their prayers, and their talk; though they have no expectation of electing the man for whom they vote. Now Sir, scarcely anything could be more inconsistent with my prayers, and my talk, when I pray I must pray for something which I hope to obtain. I cannot pray without hope. Further, when I pray I must have some evidence, either from the revealed will of God, or from the history of providence, on which to build my hope that it is his will to grant my request; otherwise my prayer is presumptuous. Again, if I pray for the abolition of slavery, I expect to receive the thing asked, in the way in which God ordinarily bestows such blessings. If my brethren pray for them in any other way, I cannot say, Amen. When I pray for good rulers, I must pray with submission to the will of God. Now I know it is his will to grant my request, it might be in one of two ways; either by the choice of the people, or by the conversion of the rulers after their election. When I know then, that

But, being pro-slavery, it is right and wise for them to bring out and support a pro-slavery candidate? This is the fair implication, or Mr. Gilliland’s statement means nothing. “It is wicked and foolish” to act like sinners, but for sinners, who are not yet converted, to bring out and support a pro-slavery candidate?—just as much as it would be for us, professing a christian nation, to bring out and support a wicked and foolish candidate, in the nation, so is it wicked and foolish, for Mr. Gilliland, Mr. Rankin or myself to support such a candidate. We thank Mr. Gilliland for his admission. It does virtually nullify his whole argument.—En Phil.

Resolved, That we regard the plan of a third political party as a departure from the principles on which the anti-

slavery society was originally organized, and as fraught with danger to the interests of the society and the cause of the slave.

Resolved, That in the opinion of this society, abolitionists can best make their influence felt either by withholding their votes altogether, or by casting them in favor of those candidates whose views on the subject of slavery assimilate nearest their own.

WM. BRYCE, Pres.

THOS. GOODMAN, Sec’y.

For the Philanthropist.

POLITICAL.

Mr. En-

lition con-

read in

not

those who

who intend to vote for H.

collect one word in the letter, that would indicate a partiality for either; and sure I am, I did not design it. My sole object in writing that letter was to show that it was the duty of every voter, when he goes to the polls, to vote for the man of his preference, among those who have any probable chance of being elected. That this is a duty which he owes to God, his country, and to himself, and I think I clearly proved it; although you and others think differently.

So long as I continue to be a citizen of the U. States, and claim the rights and privileges of a citizen, I am bound by the federal compact.—In this compact, we agree, that a president shall be chosen every four years, and that he shall be chosen, not by an individual, or by a party, but by the vote of the nation. Of the president we require a few civil qualifications, but no moral or religious ones. (Hence the covenanters cannot vote with us.) Now we enter into the compact, knowing that the nation, as such, is a pro-slavery nation; and that consequently, while it continues so we must have pro-slavery presidents. For although you did, some how or other, get up two idolatrous candidates, on one of Mr. Rankin’s islands, and have the christians of the islands to be christians; I presume such a thing never could happen. If it ever did, christians certainly acted very wickedly in not getting up a candidate of their own, and supporting him. And if the majority of the people of the U. States were abolitionists, it would be both wicked and foolish in them not to bring out a candidate and support him. But to return. According to the federal compact, each individual

Sept. 29th, 1840.

Yes they do.

It should like to know what they did support, if not abolition. No one will deny that their votes would support emancipation; but abolition is linked with this and the vote that goes for one, sustains the other.

THE PHILANTHROPIST.

EDITED BY G. BAILEY, JR.

CINCINNATI,

Tuesday Morning, October, 30, 1840.

NEW APPOINTMENT.

Mr. Christian Donaldson, on the 10th of this month, was elected by the Executive Committee of the Ohio Anti-slavery society, treasurer of the society, in the place of his brother William Donaldson, who lately left for England, whither he has gone with the hope of benefiting his health. Mr. W. Donaldson has been the treasurer of our society from its institution, and no one could excel him in the zeal, efficiency, and abundant liberality, with which he has discharged the duties of his office.

During the whole period, he has given his services gratuitously to the society, besides advancing from time to time on loan large sums of money in support of its operations. We fervently hope that a sea voyage may re-establish his health, and that finally he may be safely restored to his friends in this country, and the cause of the slave.

LIBERTY-TICKET.

Week before last, a supply of liberty-tickets, was sent to every subscriber to the Philanthropist. Those who feel no inclination to place them hand to hand to others—who would rather have them for their own use—will please send them to us by return of mail. They will of course excuse us, if it is impossible for us to know all who are for or against this movement. Again we would have it distinctly understood, that monies in the treasury of the Society are not appropriated to defray the expenses incurred in the furtherance of this political measure.

Edward Wade and Stephen Slaughter having declined to stand, the former because opposed to the nomination, the latter for other reasons; Q. F. Atkins has been nominated in the place of Mr. Wade, and Dyer Burgess in that of Mr. Slaughter. We hope that editors who have been kind enough to publish our ticket, will either republish it now or notice the change. On some of the tickets, in the name of Michael Strieby, Michael is erroneously spelt Michael. And on a few, the printer has been so careless as to head the ticket, for Vice President, Jas. G. Birney; for President, Thomas Earle. The persons receiving such tickets can easily alter them with the pen.

The friends in the several counties ought to see to it, that there be a full supply of tickets every where.

If more be needed than we have sent, they should have them printed.

Abolitionists in the city can have tickets by applying at our office.

TACTICS.

A word further on tactics. The following tract from the Friend of Man.

They who advocate the abolition of the slave trade, at the recent whig meeting in Union, from where I now stand, and in the hearing of which, declared that John C. Calhoun introduced a certain measure, (the sub-treasury bill) as a southern measure. Mr. Calhoun, continued Mr. Wiley, Calhoun knew that it must break down manufacturers and capital, and destroy the North. I conversed with Mr. Calhoun; he expressed himself contemptuously of Mr. Van Buren; he spoke of him only as a fly on the wheel. It was not his measure, said Mr. Calhoun, it was our measure. We could retrieve all or destroy it.

Singular talk for a Southern man. What has filled Mr. Stanley all at once with so general a regard for the interests of the North? This gentleman, however, is not alone among slave holders in this new-fashioned sympathy. We remarked in our last paper, that southern

Ohio during the present campaign has been pretty thoroughly canvassed by slave-holding orators. We find, that some of them have been pursuing Mr. Stanley’s policy; and what is this policy? “Now, gentlemen, you are slaveholders—you are in a community, where some capital may be raised by anti-slavery speculation. These third-party abolitionists are striving to prove both parties equal in their violence to the Slave-Power, and it will do us damage. So some of their wags—”

Mr. Calhoun, a sub-treasury scheme reduce the value of free North, and depend upon abolition votes by the quantity.”

positively that such trickery has been openly concerted, but the speech of Mr. Stanley, and various speeches from slave-holders in Ohio, clearly point to the adoption of such a policy as that just traced. Take a few facts.

Mr. Southgate, a Kentucky slaveholder, has repeatedly presented this view of the sub-treasury scheme, and so have Ex-Governors Metcalf and Tyler, if we have been correctly informed. So decidedly anti-slavery has Mr. Southgate been in his speeches, that we have long felt desirous of obtaining an accurate report of some of his sayings. At last our desire is gratified. Mr. Boyle, one of our agents, who was present at a recent whig meeting in Cadiz, has furnished the following statement.

Dr. Bailey.—When I was in Jefferson Co. an intelligent and ardent friend of the Anti-Slavery cause, (Mr. Job Wood of Martinsville) informed me that the Hon. Mr. Southgate of Ky. in a speech at Wheeling Va. before ten or twelve thousand persons, employed the very arguments of Abolitionists to prove that this nation is now, and has been for years, ruled by slavery—that the government is at the present time administered by the slave-holding power—that to the domination of this power we owe our present pecuniary embarrassments—that the present struggle between the two great political parties is the strife of liberty with slavery, of free labor with slave labor—and that, if the slavery power of the South continues to hold the reins of government, the laboring man in the North must and will be reduced to a level with the slave laborer of the South.

Learning that there was to be a great gathering at Cadiz, Harrison Co., I went to be there. When I arrived the Hon. Mr. Southgate heard his address, and that he was a Kentuckian, regarded slavery to be an evil—all regard it as a great evil, and me.

These remarks he made as he presented the sub-treasury bill, which he denounced as a slave-holding measure, designed to cripple and enslave the laboring men of the North. He insisted that this bill originated with John C. Calhoun, whose object was to give strength and stability and perpetuity to slavery, and to bring down the wages of free labor to a level with the miserable and beggarly pittance which he doles out to his negro slaves. He insisted, that while slavery existed—while the slaveholder was dependent upon the northern farmer for his produce, and upon the northern manufacturer and mechanic for the articles which they fabricate—that while he depends upon a foreign market for the sale of his cotton, the price of which the reduction of the wages of the northern man would not affect, it would most clearly be for his interest to labor most strenuously to reduce the price of all articles grown or fabricated by the free laborer of the North, because every dollar he takes out of the pocket of the northern man he puts into his own. If our flour, bacon, &c. demand a high price, we take from the cotton planter, (who is under the strength and stability and perpetuity to slavery, and the profits acquired by the sale of his cotton in Europe—but if he can greatly reduce the price of these articles among us, he can retain a greater share of these profits in his own hands.

He also strongly insisted, that the army bill recommended by the President, was another project of the slave holding power, designed to secure and perpetuate slavery; and to use his own words, “to keep John C. Calhoun’s negroes from cutting his throat.”

I have been informed by credible men, that Gov. Metcalf of Ky. and Gov. Tyler of Va. used the same language and the same arguments in their public addresses—the former at Dayton, and the latter at Columbus in this state.

Ever yours fraternally,

Oct. 12th, 1840.

JAMES BOYLE.

Of course, no one is so simple as to suppose, that Messrs. Southgate, Stanley, Wise, Morehead, Tyler, Preston, Waddy T’l.

feel greatly anxious to over-

the strength of our principles, of the American people, and, rightly, we will carry our efforts for it it justly deserves. We are; how severe may be opposition of enemies, how bitter the mockery of friends; we will believe and persevere till victory crown our efforts, and one more proof be furnished of the great truth, that a “right-minded minority,” acting in the fear of God on correct principles, is omnipotent.

What is the doctrine inculcated by Mr. Gilliland? It is, that this nation is a pro-slavery nation, and while it shall continue such, we must have pro-slavery presidents. Therefore I, as an individual, having only the two millionth part in the election of a president, so soon as I ascertain that a majority will go for pro-slavery rulers, must acquiesce in their determination, and choose between the candidates they present.—“This is the only privilege I have a right to ask to vote for a candidate of my own principles would be mere “trifling.” Such is the doctrine of Mr. Gilliland: such the argument on which he relies for the justification of those abolitionists, who have committed themselves to the support of candidates, pledged to uphold a system, which lays the lash on the bleeding back of woman, and steals her babe from her birth.

The position taken is a humiliating one, and at war with the genius of republican institutions. I, a man, a FREEMAN, a CHRISTIAN, have a man’s privilege than that of choicest apostates from the cause imposed on me by cause millions of human equal the inconveniences revolutions in trade! And is it an abolitionist who preaches such a doctrine to the citizens of the United States?—What majority in this country is invested with the prerogatives of a despot? Minority and majority are alike controlled by the constitution. The rights of the former are as completely recognized and guarded as those of the latter. That instrument secures to me sovereign power in the choice of my own rulers. It does not tell me that my only right is to choose between candidates nominated by a majority; it confers on me, on every

citizen, the right of nomination as well as choice.

If Mr. Gilliland’s doctrine be true, voting instead of being a duty to be controlled by principle, is a matter to be determined by a calculation of majorities. If in one case, the simple fact of a majority being for or against a certain measure, makes acquiescence in its will a duty, and opposition mere “trifling,” so it does in every other case. Hence, should Mr. Gilliland make up his mind that a majority of the people is in favor of Mr. Van Buren, it is his duty to submit, and to vote against him would be mere “trifling.”

But voter then has to do in any case is; to calculate on which side lies the majority, and vote accordingly. Such a doctrine would enslave the individual, and destroy the great conservative principle of representative government—which is, the opposition of minorities.

And here, let me take an opportunity to admonish on a strange doctrine lately propounded in an eastern print opposed to independent abolition. If the object, it says, of the third party men be to sustain government, they fail entirely; for a minority does not sustain government. So far is this from being the fact, every politician knows, that minorities sometimes do more to sustain government, than majorities. Aresolute minority may so trammel the action of a majority, as to make all its movements inconclusive. It may force a majority to the adoption of measures, which its leaders view with repugnance, but dare not reject. Generally, it is the conservative element of the government, restraining the operations of the majority within constitutional limits, and thus maintaining right against power. This conservative influence will differ in degree according to the character, numbers and principles of minorities. In this country, abolitionists compose a very small minority, but their influence, which is continually on the increase, has been repeatedly felt on the politics of the nation, chiefly because of the power of their principles, which are identical with those on which the republic is professedly founded. Their influence however has been comparatively limited from the fact, that they have as yet united on no systematic plan of carrying their principles to the polls. Let them do this, and persevere, and the altered action of politicians will soon acquaint Mr. Gilliland, whether a vote cast on principle, though with the certain knowledge that the candidate will not be elected, be mere “trifling.”

Nearly all majorities in the political world have originally been minorities, not unfrequently very meagre ones. Because we are but two thousand to-day, it does not follow that we shall number no more next year. But it is certain, that, unless we make a beginning some time, we shall never count even that number. The best way to rally on this question our scattered forces, is to plant our standard at once. By postponement we make no more converts; and the difficulties of a beginning will at any period hereafter have to be encountered. Were half the people converted to abolitionism, the first attempt at political action would meet with as strenuous opposition as it now does; and the numbers existing ticket would be in a very small minority. The advantage of a small, but we shall increase discussion on the subject of slavery, multiply converts faster, who, when made, will be more efficient, and gain something to the cause of freedom, in the way of direct concession from the majority, or by restraining its pro-slavery action.

The doctrine of Mr. Gilliland, as well as that of Mr. Rankin, strikes at the root of all kinds of anti-slavery political action. If I am to vote for the one of two pro-slavery candidates, whom on other points I think preferable, and I have no right to ask any other privilege, of course staying away from the polls or scattering my vote, is just as improper and “trifling,” as bestowing it on a third candidate. The doctrine argues a singular ignorance of the history of our cause, and the nature of political forces. For four years past, in different parts of the country, abolitionists, united in a greater or less degree, have been pursuing the plan of questioning candidates, and withholding, scattering, or bestowing their votes, according to the character of the replies. The result has been, that in Massachusetts, where even now they constitute but a fraction of the people, they have been able to secure the election of several abolitionists, and a large amount of anti-slavery legislation; and in New York, the effects have also been decidedly beneficial. The plan has been, where candidates answered unfavorably, to stay away from the polls, or scatter votes, which, according to Mr. Gilliland, who seems to think a vote always thrown away unless cast for the candidate elected, is mere “trifling.” But, the results of such “trifling” have been highly important. Even in our own state, several abolitionists from the northern counties have been sent to the legislature in consequence of this throwing away of votes; and, the nomination of Mr. Corwin was owing to the belief, that the little faction of abolitionists, by throwing away their votes, had defeated Governor Vance, and might defeat Mr. Whiteley. The manner in which such trifling works out important results is obvious. Suppose out of the two hundred and ninety thousand voters in this state, fifteen thousand be abolitionists; and that the difference between the two parties be represented by ten thousand. Is it not evident that the abolitionists hold the balance of power? Now, all that is wanting to give this one-twentieth part of the voting population, power, is firm and persevering adherence to the principle that, they will vote for no man who is not hostile to slavery, and a friend to the colored man. Let them take this ground, and persevere in it long enough to convince both parties of their sincerity and unyielding purpose, and who does not see what influence it must necessarily give them? But, even this kind of action, Mr. Gilliland’s doctrine excludes. He would not have us constitute even a minority, acting by negation. On the contrary, he would have

against the nomination of separate candidates, when the existing parties offer such as abolitionists can consistently vote for.

After this convention adjourned, that portion of the members of it, favorable to independent nominations, withdrew, & organized a meeting by appointing Isaac M. Clarke, of Windham, Chairman, and T. R. Dickinson, of Randolph, Secretary. This meeting nominated, as candidates for Representatives to the State Legislature, Stephen Baldwin, of Nelson, and Horatio L. Carter, of Brimfield, and also passed a resolution approving of the nominations of Messrs. Andrews and Still.—Cub. & Vts.

STEWART’S PLEDGES &c.

Press would do well to inform other correspondents of

agents he had ex-

And we would further

ask his readers to understand

question fairly, to inform them, that while some papers and politicians at the South strive to prove General Harrison unsound on the subject of slavery, multitudes of others are teeming with proof not only of his soundness, but of the anti-slavery proclivity of Martin Van Buren. And then let him commend to the notice of his readers, the following piece of information, contained in a letter from Massachusetts to the editor of the Madisonian—whereby it will be seen what construction has been placed upon Mr. Webster’s sayings and doings, by all, save a few excessively charitable abolitionists.

“I wish the Southern people could have heard the crack orator of the Loco-Foco Federalists at their Convention; I mean George Bancroft, Collector of Boston. They would have then learnt with their own eyes and ears the falsity of the pretence made by the Globe that the Northern Loco-Foco Federalists are the exclusive friends of the constitutional rights of the South on the slave question. Bancroft abused Webster and Preston for the declarations and pledges they made on the subject at Alexandria; and when he cried ‘shame’ upon Mr. Webster, and expressed indignation for the illustration he had given on that occasion of Northern subservency to the wicked institution of slavery, his Loco-Foco audience responded their ‘Amens!’ in stamping and cheering. I have not given the precise language of the orator, but its substance. Straws, &c.”

ONCE MORE.

By a communication in another column, it will be seen that the Rev. James Gilliland has thought proper to enrol himself publicly among pro-slavery voting. Separated his address, as such a production as much as it with the severity

breathes nothing of that exalted and uncompromising spirit, which has borne abolitionism onward to its present position. The policy it advocates is as dishonorable as it must prove inefficacious. The principles it embodies are essentially servile, and if carried out in application to our cause on the broad scale, would sink it beneath contempt. Had they been broached by a slaveholder or drilled pro-slavery politician, we could have borne it; but, that an abolitionist, and he a faithful preacher of righteousness, should have given them the sanction of his name, excites at once our surprise and indignation. To whatsoever consideration the age and established character of our correspondent may entitle his opinions on other subjects, so flagrantly at variance are his opinions on the political duties of abolitionists, with manly spirit, christian principle, and the maxims of a sound policy, that we feel obliged to denounce them in the most decided terms. We speak warmly on this subject, for we are weary of those teachings which would benumb the energies of abolitionists, and reduce them, like the rest of the northern people, to the condition of spiritless subjects of the Slave-Power. We wish it to be distinctly understood, that there are a few of us who, despite all the excuses, (for they scarcely deserve the name of reasons,) that can be forged for passing under the yoke of the slaveholder, have resolved to be freemen; to the strength of our principles, of the American people, and, rightly, we will carry our efforts for it it justly deserves. We are; how severe may be opposition of enemies, how bitter the mockery of friends; we will believe and persevere till victory crown our efforts, and one more proof be furnished of the great truth, that a “right-minded minority,” acting in the fear of God on correct principles, is omnipotent.

What is the doctrine inculcated by Mr. Gilliland? It is, that this nation is a pro-slavery nation, and while it shall continue such, we must have pro-slavery presidents. Therefore I, as an individual, having only the two millionth part in the election of a president, so soon as I ascertain that a majority will go for pro-slavery rulers, must acquiesce in their determination, and choose between the candidates they present.—“This is the only privilege I have a right to ask to vote for a candidate of my own principles would be mere “trifling.” Such is the doctrine of Mr. Gilliland: such the argument on which he relies for the justification of those abolitionists, who have committed themselves to the support of candidates, pledged to uphold a system, which lays the lash on the bleeding back of woman, and steals her babe from her birth.

The position taken is a humiliating one, and at war with the genius of republican institutions. I, a man, a FREEMAN, a CHRISTIAN, have a man’s privilege than that of choicest apostates from the cause imposed on me by cause millions of human equal the inconveniences revolutions in trade! And is it an abolitionist who preaches such a doctrine to the citizens of the United States?—What majority in this country is invested with the prerogatives of a despot? Minority and majority are alike controlled by the constitution. The rights of the former are as completely recognized and guarded as those of the latter. That instrument secures to me sovereign power in the choice of my own rulers. It does not tell me that my only right is to choose between candidates nominated by a majority; it confers on me, on every

citizen, the right of nomination as well as choice.

If Mr. Gilliland’s doctrine be true, voting instead of being a duty to be controlled by principle, is a matter to be determined by a calculation of majorities. If in one case, the simple fact of a majority being for or against a certain measure, makes acquiescence in its will a duty, and opposition mere “trifling,” so it does in every other case. Hence, should Mr. Gilliland make up his mind that a majority of the people is in favor of Mr. Van Buren, it is his duty to submit, and to vote against him would be mere “trifling.”

But voter then has to do in any case is; to calculate on which side lies the majority, and vote accordingly. Such a doctrine would enslave the individual, and destroy the great conservative principle of representative government—which is, the opposition of minorities.

And here, let me take an opportunity to admonish on a strange doctrine lately propounded in an eastern print opposed to independent abolition. If the object, it says, of the third party men be to sustain government, they fail entirely; for a minority does not sustain government. So far is this from being the fact, every politician knows, that minorities sometimes do more to sustain government, than majorities. Aresolute minority may so trammel the action of a majority, as to make all its movements inconclusive. It may force a majority to the adoption of measures, which its leaders view with repugnance, but dare not reject. Generally, it is the conservative element of the government, restraining the operations of the majority within constitutional limits, and thus maintaining right against power. This conservative influence will differ in degree according to the character, numbers and principles of minorities. In this country, abolitionists compose a very small minority, but their influence, which is continually on the increase, has been repeatedly felt on the politics of the nation, chiefly because of the power of their principles, which are identical with those on which the republic is professedly founded. Their influence however has been comparatively limited from the fact, that they have as yet united on no systematic plan of carrying their principles to the polls. Let them do this, and persevere, and the altered action of politicians will soon acquaint Mr. Gilliland, whether a vote cast on principle, though with the certain knowledge that the candidate will not be elected, be mere “trifling.”

Nearly all majorities in the political world have originally been minorities, not unfrequently very meagre ones. Because we are but two thousand to-day, it does not follow that we shall number no more next year. But it is certain, that, unless we make a beginning some time, we shall never count even that number. The best way to rally on this question our scattered forces, is to plant our standard at once. By postponement we make no more converts; and the difficulties of a beginning will at any period hereafter have to be encountered. Were half the people converted to abolitionism, the first attempt at political action would meet with as strenuous opposition as it now does; and the numbers existing ticket would be in a very small minority. The advantage of a small, but we shall increase discussion on the subject of slavery, multiply converts faster, who, when made, will be more efficient, and gain something to the cause of freedom, in the way of direct concession from the majority, or by restraining its pro-slavery action.

The doctrine of Mr. Gilliland, as well as that of Mr. Rankin, strikes at the root of all kinds of anti-slavery political action. If I am to vote for the one of two pro-slavery candidates, whom on other points I think preferable, and I have no right to ask any other privilege, of course staying away from the polls or scattering my vote, is just as improper and “trifling,” as bestowing it on a third candidate. The doctrine argues a singular ignorance of the history of our cause, and the nature of political forces. For four years past, in different parts of the country, abolitionists, united in a greater or less degree, have been pursuing the plan of questioning candidates, and withholding, scattering, or bestowing their votes, according to the character of the replies. The result has been, that in Massachusetts, where even now they constitute but a fraction of the people, they have been able to secure the election of several abolitionists, and a large amount of anti-slavery legislation; and in New York, the effects have also been decidedly beneficial. The plan has been, where candidates answered unfavorably, to stay away from the polls, or scatter votes, which, according to Mr. Gilliland, who seems to think a vote always thrown away unless cast for the candidate elected, is mere “trifling.” But, the results of such “trifling” have been highly important. Even in our own state, several abolitionists from the northern counties have been sent to the legislature in consequence of this throwing away of votes; and, the nomination of Mr. Corwin was owing to the belief, that the little faction of abolitionists, by throwing away their votes, had defeated Governor Vance, and might defeat Mr. Whiteley. The manner in which such trifling works out important results is obvious. Suppose out of the two hundred and ninety thousand voters in this state, fifteen thousand be abolitionists; and that the difference between the two parties be represented by ten thousand. Is it not evident that the abolitionists hold the balance of power? Now, all that is wanting to give this one-twentieth part of the voting population, power, is firm and persevering adherence to the principle that, they will vote for no man who is not hostile to slavery, and a friend to the colored man. Let them take this ground, and persevere in it long enough to convince both parties of their sincerity and unyielding purpose, and who does not see what influence it must necessarily give them? But, even this kind of action, Mr. Gilliland’s doctrine excludes. He would not have us constitute even a minority, acting by negation. On the contrary, he would have

This image shows a vertical strip of a document page. The right side is a dark, textured binding edge. The left side is a light-colored page with faint, illegible text. A small, dark, irregular mark is visible near the bottom center of the page.

